

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/817,507 04/17/97 KISHIMOTO

T 53466/201

HM12/0812

EXAMINER

HAROLD WEGNER
FOLEY & LARDNER
3000 K STREET NW SUITE 500
PO BOX 25696
WASHINGTON DC 20007-8696

BURKE, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

16

DATE MAILED: 08/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action	Application No. 08/817,507	Applicant(s) Kishimoto et al
	Examiner Julie E. Burke, (Reeves), Ph.D.	Group Art Unit 1642

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) expires four months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 19 Jul 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

The proposed amendment(s):

- will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- will not be entered because:
 - they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
 - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
 - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: the limitation of "human" has been added to the claims and this term raises new issues that would require further search and consideration.

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

had the amdt been entered, it would have overcome the claim objections; 112 2nd claim rejections; 112, 1st deposit rejection; 102(b) rejection

Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

the response argues that "applicants are not aware of any prior art which shows that an IL-6R antibody inhibits the growth of cancer cells" (page 4-5, bridging para). This is not persuasive because 103 clearly cites (See Other)

The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 15-28

The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ has has not been approved by the Examiner.

Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____.

Other the Sato et al abstract teaches that PM-1 humanized and chimeric forms were equal in terms of antigen binding and growth inhibition against multiple myleoma cells".

IDS has not been entered as proper fees/petition/certification are missing. The Amdt to pg 1 of the spec cannot be entered because it is not clear which occurrence of "claims priority to" is intended.

Julie Burke
JULIE BURKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER